

THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY



3 1151 02745 1651



THE  
**ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.**

No. 72.]                      DECEMBER 1, 1837.                      [Vol. iii. No. 24.

The "ANTI-SLAVERY MONTHLY REPORTER" will be forwarded to any Anti-Slavery Society, at the rate of four Shillings per hundred, when not exceeding half a sheet, and in proportion, when it exceeds that quantity, on application at the Society's office, No 18, Aldermanbury. Single Copies may be had of all booksellers and newsmen, at the rate of 1*d.* per half-sheet of eight pages.

---

REPLY TO AN ATTACK ON THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, CONTAINED  
IN A PAMPHLET BY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE R. WILMOT HORTON,  
ENTITLED, "FIRST LETTER TO THE FREEHOLDERS OF THE COUNTY  
OF YORK, ON NEGRO SLAVERY," &c.

A PAMPHLET has recently appeared, from the pen of the Right Hon. R. Wilmot Horton, late Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, bearing this title:—"First Letter to the Freeholders of the County of York, on Negro Slavery: being an Inquiry into the Claims of the West Indians for equitable Compensation." We are induced to notice this pamphlet, chiefly on account of the authority which may be thought to attach to it, in consequence of the official situation which its author filled so long, and which naturally gave him a ready access to the best sources of information. But for this circumstance it would hardly have called for animadversion, as it is no more than a reimpression, slightly altered to suit existing circumstances, of a former pamphlet published by him in 1826, and placed on their list by the Colonial Committee, entitled "The West India Question practically considered." The two pamphlets are marked, as we might expect, by the same characteristic peculiarities. They are employed either in laboriously proving admitted truths; or in eagerly combating mere shadows, the creation of the author's own fancy.

With respect to the former point, we need only to repeat what we said on the publication of the first of these two pamphlets, in 1826, (see Anti-Slavery Reporter, No. 11, p. 168.)—that the author might have spared all the pains he has taken to convince the world that the views now entertained by the leading abolitionists on the subject of the necessity and expediency of legislative interference, with respect to colonial slavery, have undergone a great change since 1792, and even since 1807. This fact is so far from having been denied, that it has been fully and freely admitted. Nay, it stands prominently forward as the very ground on which, in 1823, the men of 1792 and of 1807 formed themselves into a Society, for the avowed purpose of abolishing slavery in every part of the British dominions.\* But, (we then asked, as we now ask again) if the abolitionists formerly

---

\* See substance of the Debate of the 15th of May, 1823. Preface, pp. 10, 11.

placed an unwarranted and too liberal confidence in the purposes of the colonists to improve the condition of their slaves, are they, or are those who have entered into their labours to be blamed, as wanting either in consistency or in good faith, because the painful experience of twenty-three years has satisfied them that their confidence was misplaced, and that all hope of improvement in the condition of the slave, and still more, all hope of his emancipation, except from parliamentary interference, has become vain and illusory? On this point, therefore, the author may now, as in 1826, enjoy his fancied victory undisturbed by any denial. We plead guilty; and we feel no shame in the avowal.

Again, with respect to the author's charge against the abolitionists of departing from the compact, by which he alleges they bound themselves, to abide by the resolutions of the 15th of May, 1823, he has entirely overlooked the circumstance that they, one and all, protested, at the time, against committing the work of reformation to the Colonial Assemblies, and only forbore from pressing the matter to a division, in consequence of the deliberate promise of the Government, that in case those assemblies refused to comply with the wishes of parliament, the interference of parliament would unquestionably be applied for. We here allude not merely to Mr. Canning's speech on that occasion, published and accredited by Lord Bathurst, in his circular addressed to the colonial governors on the 28th of May, 1823, but to the following passage in the subsequent despatch of the 9th of July, 1823, which may probably have proceeded from the pen of the right hon. gentleman himself.—“In conclusion, I have most earnestly to impress upon you the necessity of proceeding to carry these improvements into effect, not only *with all possible dispatch*, but in the spirit of perfect and cordial co-operation with the efforts of his Majesty's government;”—and if (which I am unwilling to imagine) you should meet with any serious opposition, you will lose no time in transmitting to me the necessary communication, in order that I may take the *earliest opportunity of laying the matter before parliament, and submitting for their consideration such measures as it may be fit to adopt in consequence.*”

Has, then, the compact of 1823 been violated? It undoubtedly has—and we think that on the ministers of the crown rests the guilt of its violation, not exempting from a share of that guilt the right hon. gentleman himself. Nor is our estimate of its amount at all lessened by reverting to the fallacious statements, whencesoever derived, which were officially laid before parliament by Mr. Canning, and more particularly in March 1826, on the subject of colonial reform; and which were so fully exposed at the time in the *Reporters*, Nos. 10 and 11.

The author will not deny that, in 1823, a solemn engagement was entered into by government, to adopt “determined and vigorous” measures, for accomplishing, “at the earliest period,” the emancipation of the slaves, in other words, the words of the resolution, “their participation in those civil rights and privileges which are enjoyed by other classes of his Majesty's subjects.” He cannot deny this.—Does he then blame the abolitionists, for insisting on the fulfilment of this pledge, and

for complaining of its forfeiture on his part and that of his associates? No, not entirely so: but he blames them for doing this "WITHOUT EQUITABLE COMPENSATION." We distinctly deny this charge; and we call upon him to say whether he or any of the members of government ever brought forward any proposition for *equitable compensation* which was resisted by the abolitionists. Had not he and his colleagues forcibly taken the matter out of Mr. Buxton's hands? Was it not for them to have adopted the means of fulfilling their own pledges? Was it Mr. Buxton's part or theirs to have done this? Or were they ever prevented by him, or by any one of his friends, from propounding what might appear to them equitable, with a view to the accomplishment of the great purpose to which they had so solemnly bound themselves? So far from it, the abolitionists often and in vain urged the government to do so at whatever cost. This was the burden of almost every Anti-Slavery petition addressed to parliament from one end of the kingdom to the other. Even the Anti-Slavery Society itself, in its petition of 1826, professed its perfect readiness, if called upon to contribute whatever sum might be deemed necessary to the extinction of slavery, cheerfully to obey the call.

And yet, will it be believed, that after all this, in 1830, the right hon. gentleman should write a pamphlet, to denounce the Anti-Slavery party as men of bad faith, as men guilty of violating their compact with government and the planters, in demanding abolition without compensation!!

His proof of this charge is sufficiently whimsical, and not a little characteristic. He places in the title-page, as his motto, a passage in which the Anti-Slavery Society fully recognizes the right of the planters to prefer, and, by adequate proof, to establish their claim to indemnity. The whole of the passage from which he has drawn his motto, is as follows:—

"It is by no means intended to attribute the existence and continuance of this most opprobrious system to our Colonies exclusively. On the contrary, the guilt and shame arising from it belong in perhaps an equal degree to the people and parliament of this country. But on that very account are we the more rigidly bound to lose no time in investigating the state of colonial bondage, and in adopting such measures as shall bring it to the earliest termination which is compatible with the well-being of the parties who sustain its grievous yoke.

"But, besides our paramount and indispensable obligations, on moral and religious grounds, to relieve our colonial bondsmen from the cruel and degrading state to which we have reduced them, and to remedy as far as we can the numberless wrongs of which we have been the criminal authors; it is further due to the character of Great Britain, in the eyes of foreign nations, that we should act agreeably to the principles which, in our discussions with them relative to the African Slave Trade, we have professed to make the basis of our representations. It would be vain to expect that they should regard those professions as otherwise than insincere, or that they should defer to our representations, however urgent, if we exhibit in our own conduct the glaring inconsistency of sanctioning as legal, in our own dominions, practices of the very same nature, in effect, with those which we reprobate and denounce as immoral, inhuman, and unjust, when they occur on the coast of Africa.

"It is therefore our clear and indisputable duty completely to reform our present colonial system, even if it should require a large pecuniary sacrifice to

accomplish that object. But the proposed change, we believe, is prescribed to us not more by moral and religious principle, than by the soundest views of political expediency. In the present advanced state of knowledge, it can no longer be a question that the labour of slaves is much less profitable than that of freemen, and that it can only be supported at a very heavy expense to the community at large. In proof of this, it will be sufficient to adduce the protecting duties and bounties afforded to the growers of sugar in the West Indies; and without which they declare it would be impossible for them to continue its culture. Indeed, we are persuaded that no institution which is directly at variance with the will of the Supreme Governor of the Universe can prove a source of permanent advantage either to nations or individuals. And, in the present case, it might be clearly demonstrated, that the personal slavery which deforms the face of society in the British colonies, and stains the British character, is as detrimental to the interests of the slave-owner as it is cruel and oppressive to the slave; and that its abolition, instead of proving an injury to either, will prove an unspeakable benefit to both.

"The Colonists say, that they shall sustain a great actual loss by the proposed change of system. If so, they will of course have an opportunity of preferring and establishing their claim to indemnity. But, whatever the extent of that claim may be proved to be, it is obvious that it attaches not to the negro bondsmen, but to the British nation. It would be repugnant to every idea of equity, if we were to discharge any debt we may owe to the colonists, not from our own resources, but with the toil and sweat and blood of our African brethren.

"But, in whatever degree it may be found necessary to indemnify the colonists for any loss which may arise to them from the abolition of negro slavery, yet, *while that state of society continues unchanged*, there will be an insuperable objection in the mind of every conscientious individual to the adoption of any measures of pecuniary relief, by means of protecting duties or bounties on their produce, or otherwise; because it is obvious that such measures, however modified, would involve the people of this country in the farther guilt of upholding a system which, when the facts of the case are known, it is impossible not to feel to be utterly repugnant to the principles of justice and humanity, and to the whole spirit of Christianity."

But this clear and unambiguous declaration, the right hon. gentleman may allege, was published in April 1823. We admit it. But then we have it in our power to lay before him a second edition of the same paper, which has furnished him with his motto, entitled, "A brief View of the Nature and Effects of Negro Slavery, as it exists in the Colonies of Great Britain," and which bears date, not in April, 1823, but on the 1st of October, 1830. Now this paper, which has been circulated very largely throughout all parts of the kingdom, though it contains statements varying in some respects from those contained in the former edition, in consequence of the intermediate changes which have taken place in the laws of slavery, yet gives the above passage without a single material variation. Indeed the only variation consists in the omission of these words in the first paragraph of the extract, "in investigating the state of colonial bondage, and;" it being justly thought that the work of investigation has now been sufficiently fulfilled.

And yet in the face of this apparently overwhelming evidence, to which much more might be added in corroboration, the right hon. gentleman comes forward with his "First Letter to the men of Yorkshire," to denounce the abolitionists as denying and resisting the claim of the planters to equitable compensation, and to establish

against them, by laboured proof, this groundless charge. It is true, they have said nothing as to the amount of compensation; neither has the right hon. gentleman. He has concurred with them, probably, in thinking that that is a point to be settled, neither by the exaggerated claims of the planters, nor by the vehement objections of individual declaimers, but by the sober estimate of an impartial and enlightened tribunal, deciding fairly and dispassionately on the subject according to evidence.

On what ground, then, is it, that the right hon. gentleman has contrived to raise a controversy between himself and the Anti-Slavery party on this subject? It is on a ground quite as whimsical and untenable as any we have yet noticed. He assumes it as a principle of his reasoning, that the very call for the early and entire extinction of slavery proves that it is intended, by the parties so calling, to be effected "*without equitable compensation.*" This, we must take leave to say, is a somewhat extravagant, and certainly a most unwarrantable assumption, and yet the whole of his pamphlet is founded upon it. For our own parts, with all respect for the superior sagacity of our author, we cannot discover what difference it can possibly make, as to the principle on which the question of equitable compensation rests, whether the abolition shall take place in 1831, 1841, or 1851. The equity of the matter remains the same on either supposition; and we are utterly unable to divine by what species of logic the right hon. gentleman has arrived at the conclusion, that because Mr. Brougham pledged himself to the Yorkshire Electors "never to cease from his labours till the chains shall have dropped from the hands of the slave;" and because the Hull Anti-Slavery Society have resolved to call for "the speedy extinction of slavery;" that either Mr. B. or the members of the Hull Society will refuse to concur in any *just and reasonable* proposition, which he or any other person may bring forward, for carrying into effect that part also of the compact of 1823, which relates to the question of equitable compensation. And yet this speech of Mr. Brougham, and these resolutions of the Hull Society, which are only samples, we admit, of many similar speeches and similar resolutions, form all the ground we can discover for this weighty charge. We doubt whether labour and thought were ever so completely thrown away. Nay, if the author had only taken the trouble to read with ordinary attention the publications of the Society, which for years past, in various ways, it has been his labour to assail; or to look into a few of the thousands of petitions presented to Parliament on the subject, he would not have found there even a single attempt to controvert the position, that equitable compensation to the planter is a fair subject of parliamentary consideration. Nay, in not a few of them, he would have found even liberal offers to bear their share of any indemnity to which, on investigation, the planters might prove (for with them must the *onus probandi* rest) that they were equitably entitled.

Such being the state of the question between the right hon. gentleman and the special objects of his attack, we think we were perfectly justified in the remark with which we set out, that both this

and his former pamphlet on the subject, were employed either in laboriously proving admitted truths, or in eagerly combating mere shadows, the creation of the author's own fancy."

We might here close this unprofitable controversy, were it not for some incidental statements of the right hon. gentleman, the accuracy of which appears to us to be questionable, and which we shall therefore take the liberty of examining. We shall cite for this purpose the following passage.

"If you refer to a recent publication of the Anti-Slavery Society, you will find much criticism on the presumed defects and omissions of this Order in Council; and it will be for those who pursue a critical study of this great question, to form a judgment of the relevancy or irrelevancy of that criticism. On one material point, I have already expressed my opinion in the House of Commons, in accordance with the sentiments of the Anti-Slavery Society: but this at least must be conceded, (and the concession is quite enough for any argument which I am prepared to sustain in this letter) that if certain modifications do take place in this Order in Council, the six ceded colonies, containing a population of 300,000 slaves, will have completely and entirely embodied in their laws ALL those temperate and prudent recommendations which the abolitionists personally approved, and which were founded on the temperate and prudent resolutions of Mr. Canning.

"I put aside, then, the case of the colonies having local legislatures, for the purpose of considering that of the ceded colonies, where the interests of the proprietors in their slaves is *just as strong and undoubted* as in the case of the legislative colonies; and I ask of you the following questions: Supposing that, upon examination of the Order in Council of February, 1830, you are of opinion that it ought to be modified according to the criticisms of the Anti-Slavery Society, can you deny, that, *if it should be so modified* by another Order in Council, the temperate and prudent recommendations of the Government, founded upon Mr. Canning's resolutions, will have been carried into effect in the ceded colonies? And will you in that case be prepared to call for the *sudden extinction* of slavery in those colonies, WITHOUT EQUITABLE COMPENSATION?

"The ceded colonies, as I have already stated, have not the power of legislation. The British Government has carried certain meliorations into effect, according to its view of what was required by the resolutions of Parliament. If those meliorations do *not come up* to the proper standard, whose fault is it? In such a case, the existing Government ought to be impeached, rather than the property of the planters in the ceded colonies confiscated. Whatever, therefore, may be said with respect to the colonies having local legislatures, it is impossible, with common justice, to escape from the necessity of granting equitable compensation to the proprietors in the ceded colonies. In the case, then, of the ceded colonies, if you are not satisfied with the law as it now exists, or as it will exist when the Order in Council shall have been amended, (including compulsory manumission,) what is your project, and where are your funds?

"But it may be said, 'we will not emancipate the slaves in the ceded colonies, but we will at once emancipate those in the colonies having no legislatures.' If justice to the slave be the object, how are any principles of justice to be reconciled with the distinction? In that case the emancipation of the slaves will be effected, rather as a punishment to the planters, than as a measure intended for the well-being of the slaves. If your object be to punish the planters, there are many better modes of punishment than the measure of emancipation."

What we have already said will shew, how totally wide of the mark are these observations. We are not conscious, in the first place, of ever having made any such distinctions as the right hon. gentleman supposes. In truth, had we done so, they would have been dis-



functions of a very different description. Instead of maintaining his affirmative proposition, that the claims of the ceded colonies are as strong and undoubted as those of the old colonies, we should have added to it the monosyllable *not*. But into this part of the question we shall not now be tempted to digress, as it is foreign to our present purpose. Suffice it to say, that we have nowhere attempted to raise distinctions between the claims of different classes of slaveholders, whatever may be our opinions on the subject, as interfering with any claims of equitable adjustment. We pass therefore from that point, in order to express our unfeigned astonishment, that, familiar as the right hon. gentleman seems to be with the criticisms of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, he should have so far misapprehended its sentiments, as to assume that it regarded the Consolidated Order in Council of February last, as forming, with "certain modifications," a complete and entire fulfilment of the pledges of his Majesty's Government on the subject of reform, as respects the crown colonies. In the very Reporter to which he refers, what is the language held? (No. 58. p. 154.) It is that, even if ALL the measures proposed by government had been carried into full effect, we could only regard them as steps towards the final extinction of slavery throughout the British dominions; in other words, as steps towards the great object, which the resolutions of May, 1823, professed and promised to accomplish, namely, the introduction of the colonial slaves to a full participation of the civil rights and privileges enjoyed by other classes of his Majesty's subjects.

But is it true, that ALL the measures proposed by his Majesty's ministers have been carried into effect, even in the crown colonies? Our author affirms this to be the case, and hesitates not to assume, that certain modifications would, even in our view, have rendered them complete. We totally dissent from this assumption, and pronounce it to be a complete, though doubtless unintentional misrepresentation of our opinions; but still hardly excusable, in one so familiar with the details of the question as the right hon. gentleman.

But let us look more closely at the subject, and first, with respect to education and religious instruction.

In 1823, this point was placed in the fore-front of all the contemplated measures of reform. It was professedly made to rank in importance above all others, both by the ministers of the crown and by the colonial planters. And yet, in the crown colonies, subject as they are to the sole, exclusive, and uncontrolled legislation of the crown, what has been done to promote this avowedly paramount object? Literally nothing. Not a single clause in any one order of council yet issued, not even in the late consolidated order which our author represents as so complete, relates to this object, or provides for the dedication of a single hour of the slave's time to its attainment. Education and religious instruction formed, in 1823, a prominent feature, both of the speeches of Mr. Canning, and of the dispatches of the right hon. gentleman's principal, Lord Bathurst. And yet, in act and effect, they are an utter nullity. A bishop and some clergymen, it is true, have been appointed, and salaries have

been given them, but not one clause of enactment has issued, to give scope or efficacy to their labours. Their appointments and their salaries, therefore, only render the mockery of the proceeding the more remarkable, and the violation of solemn professions and reiterated pledges the less excusable.

Closely connected with this part of the case, is the total violation of another pledge, no less solemnly and explicitly given—a pledge to secure to the slave the full enjoyment of the repose, and of the other temporal as well as spiritual advantages of the sabbath. This, it was admitted on all hands, nay, by the West Indians themselves, could not be effected in any other way than by affording to the slave equivalent time in lieu of Sunday. In no other way could the necessity of his labouring, on that day, for his own subsistence and that of his family, or of his attending Sunday markets, be obviated. Now, in the *all perfect* Order in Council of February last, Sunday markets are abolished, and *compulsory* labour on the Sunday is forbidden; yet the law gives no time to the slave, to enable him either to attend market on any other day, or to exempt him from the stringent necessity of toiling on the Sunday, to raise food for himself and his family. In short, he must still work on that day or starve. The right hon. gentleman cannot deny this statement; neither can he deny, that it involves not only a violation of the pledges of government, and especially of that government to which he was attached, but that it is also an act of extreme cruelty and injustice to the slaves, for which we cannot even imagine the shadow of an adequate apology.

But it is not merely as it affects the moral and religious interests of the slaves, or their bodily health, that this unaccountable violation of good faith, and of all justice and humanity, is to be reprobated; though these are considerations of paramount importance: but as it affects the operation of other parts of the Order, and especially of the much debated and much vaunted manumission clause. The predial slave, while forced as now to employ the Sunday in labour, in order to procure a bare subsistence for himself and family, can have no hope whatever of effecting any accumulation of property. The thing is impossible, and is proved to be so by the utter abortion of the plan of Savings' Banks, in as far at least as respects the predial slave. So that this most unjust arrangement is not only destructive of health, and incompatible with any progress in religious knowledge, but it extinguishes all expectation of benefit to the predial slave from the power of self manumission. To profess, therefore, under these circumstances, to give him that power, is little better than an act of derision.

But the Anti-Slavery Reporter has dwelt so often and at such length on this important subject, that the right hon. gentleman must be familiar with these incontrovertible positions. We shall therefore only refer him and our readers to the passages noted in the margin, as containing full information upon it.\*

---

\* No. 11, p. 132—135, 156; No. 21, p. 303; No. 27, p. 31; No. 30, p. 131; No. 34, p. 186; No. 41, p. 311, 314; No. 48, p. 471; No. 52, p. 56 and 75; No. 58, p. 134—139; No. 60, p. 195—201; No. 66, p. 384; No. 71, p. 480.

It was further promised by the government, that no one who was a proprietor of slaves, or interested in slave property, should be appointed by the crown to the offices of protector of slaves, governor, judge, fiscal, &c. How has this promise been kept in all the crown colonies? The protector, to whom the chief guardianship of the slaves is committed in each colony, is indeed wholly debarred from having any interest in slave property. But in every one of these colonies, his assistants, on whom the duty of protecting the slaves, and especially the predial part of them, must of necessity fall, are to a man slave holders. The evils of such a system we need not insist upon. They are acknowledged in the very restrictions laid on the chief protector; they have been recognized, on a variety of occasions, by his Majesty's government; and they have been exposed, over and over again, with all their disastrous effects, in the pages of the Anti-Slavery Reporter;\* and yet, they remain, to this very hour, wholly unredressed.

But it were endless to enter into farther details on this subject, or to repeat statements which the right hon. gentleman knows we have already repeated even to satiety. We are not satisfied, we never were satisfied, and we have never expressed ourselves satisfied, with the provisions of the Order in Council; and we have continued to dwell on their defects, even to the fatigue of our readers. But still we must not withhold from them or from our author, a new and invaluable testimony to the validity of many of the objections which we have not ceased to urge, for seven long years, but which were wholly unheeded by the right hon. gentleman while he remained in office. The testimony we have to produce is that of Sir George Murray, who, in a late circular despatch to the governors of crown colonies, dated the 4th of February, 1830, thus feelingly expresses himself with respect to the defects of this very Order, which Mr. Wilmot Horton holds to be perfect and complete, and which he would make the *ne plus ultra* of improvement.

"I am well aware," says Sir George, "that there are some topics connected with the improvement of the condition of slavery, which are omitted in this Order, although superior in importance to some of those which it embraces; amongst these I may particularly mention THE DURATION OF THE DAILY LABOUR OF THE PLANTATION SLAVES; THEIR FOOD AND CLOTHING; and above all, THEIR RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION." (How Sir George should overlook, in this enumeration, the want of time in lieu of Sunday, is to us inconceivable.) "If it had been the design of his Majesty's ministers," he adds, "to frame a complete code for the government of the slaves, a prominent place must have been assigned to topics of this nature; but for the present nothing farther has been contemplated than to consolidate the Order in Council of the 10th March, 1824, and the most valuable of the

---

\* See No. 11, p. 142; No. 21, p. 298; No. 33, p. 178; No. 34, p. 192; No. 38, p. 261; No. 39, p. 287; No. 43, p. 346, and p. 355—358; No. 54, p. 142—145; No. 66, 373—382, and 386; No. 68, p. 416—421; No. 69, p. 429—441; No. 71, p. 481—496.

provisions which have been engrafted upon it by supplementary enactments, either in Trinidad or in other separate crown colonies." In a subsequent despatch, of the 18th February, 1830, he calls for official information on the subject of the duration of slave labour, which must prove invaluable. We trust the call has been answered, and that the information will speedily be produced.

It is now time, however, that we should reply to the question propounded to us in the last extract. Our answer to it is, that if this *all-perfect* Order were carried into effect, not only in the crown but in the chartered colonies, and there were added to it all our suggested emendations, and all the supplementary measures of Sir George Murray, we should not the less, on that account, continue to call for the early and entire extinction of slavery, without, at the same time, opposing the slightest obstacle to the fair and full consideration of every equitable claim for compensation which the planters may prefer, or are able by satisfactory proof to establish.

The right hon. gentleman tells us, that in the case which we have now proved beyond dispute, namely, that of the failure of ministers to *come up* to the proper standard of their pledges in 1823, they "ought to be impeached." We will not contest with the right hon. gentleman their claim to that honour, especially as he himself, who is unquestionably a *particeps criminis*, even if he pleads *not guilty*, must allow that we have at least produced a strong *prima facie* case, which furnishes a presumption that, if fairly tried, the plea would prove unavailing.

But the author has propounded another question, which he seems to think will completely strike dumb the abolitionists, and especially Mr. Brougham, who happened some thirty years ago to say, that Africans must undergo "a radical change" before they are fit for freedom. "Have the negroes," he asks, "undergone that radical change?" This kind of catechetical lecture appears to us, with all due respect to him, to be misplaced. Would he himself be willing to be catechized as to all he wrote or said thirty years ago? Besides, have we had no experience to enlighten us in the course of those thirty years? Let the right hon. gentleman only read the Anti-Slavery Reporter, No. 70, for an answer. But independently of this, if we were not anxious to hurry to a close, it would be easy to point out innumerable absurdities involved in this question of the right hon. gentleman. Does he mean to say that there is any *radical* difference between a black infant born, in Jamaica for instance, of a free person, and one born of a slave? Or that black children in Sierra Leone, in Mexico, or in Hayti, are differently constituted from what they are in Jamaica, in Demerara, or in Barbadoes? Or that even black men and women are made of different materials, and endowed by nature with different dispositions from those with which white men and women are endowed? There is no end of such tritling. It savours too much of Major Moody's school, to which we are sorry to perceive that the right hon. gentleman retains some lurking attachment. We find him even producing the Major, as having proved some point "in the clearest

manner," so as to constitute, it seems, "an *axiom*" in the Philosophy of Labour. But to cite Major Moody as a clear reasoner, nay, as a propounder of axioms which are to pass current in the world, seems an aberration of the same kind which has made Mr. Brougham responsible for an opinion uttered in youth, and long since disavowed; or which exhibits it as a necessary corollary from the call of that gentleman, or of any other, for early and entire abolition, that he should exclude all consideration of equitable compensation to the planters. We hardly expected to have seen Major Moody again quoted as an authority, by any reasonable person, since the publication of the Edinburgh Review, No. XC. And although the right hon. gentleman might be excused for a feeling of partiality towards the views of the Major, yet we should hardly have expected that he would refer to him as a decisive umpire in this controversy.

We cannot discover another syllable in this pamphlet which requires from us the slightest notice. All that remains is a prolongation of the battle with shadows, which, from first to last, characterizes the productions of our author on this question.

Before we close this article, we beg to assure the right honourable gentleman, that it is with great reluctance we have been compelled by his new attack upon us once more to enter the lists of controversy against him. Whether the pamphlet before us will add to his reputation as a statesman, we leave to others to determine. It must, at least, have the effect of confirming and perpetuating, in the public mind, the impression of his unfriendly feeling towards the cause of negro freedom, which was created by his former writings, and by the general tenor of his official conduct. He has, it is true, disclaimed any such feeling, and has denounced its imputation as unwarranted and unjust. And yet, how is the public to form a judgment of public men but by their public conduct? And when they have seen the right honourable gentleman uniformly palliating or defending in parliament colonial abuse or outrage; and when they have also seen his writings, either selected by the colonial club for insertion in their list of works favourable to the colonial cause, or received with acclamation by every colonial coterie, and lauded in every colonial journal: what other conclusion was it possible for him to expect they should come to, but that to which they have come? His present pamphlet, he must allow, is not calculated to efface the impression of which he has so loudly complained, and he must therefore be content, without some great change in his views and conduct, to rank in public estimation among the chief advocates of colonial bondage; second to none, indeed, in talent: and in zeal, inferior only to such men as Macqueen and Moody, as Barclay and Macdonnell.

But as the right hon. gentleman appears to have taken his side in this controversy, we recommend it to him no longer to waste his strength in combating the comparatively puny efforts of the Anti-Slavery Reporter; but to grapple at once with an antagonist worthy of him, we mean Mr. Stephen, the refutation of whose recent work on slavery will afford abundant scope to the exertion of all his talents; and may supply him with a large fund of materials for the series of letters with which he threatens the freeholders of Yorkshire.

We are forcibly reminded, by the names of the four colonial champions just mentioned, as well as by the work we have now reviewed, of some propositions which, three or four years ago, we deduced from their publications of that period, in conjunction with the former pamphlet of the right hon. gentleman. One of these propositions was:—(see Reporter, No. 11, p. 170.)

“That though it is admitted that the British nation and the colonists have been guilty of a great crime, in subjecting the negroes to slavery, yet compensation is due, not from the criminals to each other, or to the victims of their crime, but is due from the negroes to their oppressors; and that, in order to furnish this compensation to the criminals, the unoffending victims of their crime must be retained ~~in slavery~~ <sup>in the same state</sup>, if need be, in their present abject and degraded state.”

Now ~~we~~ <sup>it is</sup> somewhat remarkable, that, after the lapse of nearly four years, we should have another pamphlet from the pen of the right hon. gentleman, treating of negro slavery in a manner perfectly justifying this proposition.—On the claim of the injured and outraged negro to compensation, he bestows not one thought, nor, on *his* forlorn and helpless condition, even one passing glance of pity. He bestows, as before, his undivided anxiety, and expends the whole current of his sympathies, on the possible loss of some fraction of property which may accrue to the master. Here again he and we are widely separated as the poles. Our clear opinion, as we have often stated it, is, that if there be any one party more indubitably entitled to indemnity than another, it is the slave: who, even if the right hon. gentleman's favourite plan of compulsory manumission were carried into full effect, would have this injury added to all his other wrongs, that he is to be condemned to pay, with his coerced labour, the penalty of the criminal conduct of his oppressor.

---

\* \* The Third Volume of the Anti-Slavery Reporter being now brought to a close, we take the opportunity of apprising our readers that, through some typographical oversight, the paging from p. 129 to p. 182 inclusive, has been repeated. The first series of these double numbers comprises Nos. 54, 55, 56, and 57. The second series commences with No. 58.—We know of no better way to obviate the inconvenient effect of this oversight, in quoting from this third volume, than to refer always both to the page of the volume, and to the number of the Reporter. In the Index means will be taken to distinguish the second series of pages from the first.



